UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,888	10/06/2003	Nader Najafi	IB-12	3813
	7590 12/16/200 HARTMAN, P.C.	EXAMINER		
552 EAST 700	NORTH	MALLARI, PATRICIA C		
VALPARAISO), IN 40383		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3735	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

domenica@hartmaniplaw.com gayle@hartmaniplaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/679,888	NAJAFI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PATRICIA C. MALLARI	3735	

		T / (TT (TO)) (O: IV) (EE) (I (I	0700
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY	FILED <u>10 November 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.
applica applica	ply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on ation, applicant must timely file one of the following ation in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appo ntinued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (s:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) 🔲 Th	e period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
no Ex	e period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I aminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
Extensions of have been file under 37 CFR set forth in (b)	DNTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date id is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex it 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the site above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later in earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
	otice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing th	ne Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
(a) <u>□</u>	roposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c)	They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially red	
(a) 🗀	They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.
4. 🔲 The a	mendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1:		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applio	cant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:	
non-al	y proposed or amended claim(s) would be all lowable claim(s).	·	
how th The st Claim(Claim(Claim(rposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) e new or amended claims would be rejected is provatus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: s) allowed: s) objected to: s) rejected: s) withdrawn from consideration:		i be entered and an explanation of
	OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
becaus	fidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, buse applicant failed to provide a showing of good and to tearlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		
entere	fidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing d because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c ng a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
	affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
11. 🛛 The r	equest for reconsideration has been considered bu Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application in	condition for allowance because:
12.	the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
		/Patricia C. Mallari/	
		Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3735

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments as to the rejection of claim 30 are not persuasive. Figures 15 and 16 do not agree with the 6% value arbitrarily assigned to the percentage of cross-sectional flow area of the artery occupied by the sensor package. Furthermore, and more importantly, a partial blockage does indeed constitute blockage, such that the prior art teaches the step of blocking the second pulmonary artery, as claimed. The claim fails to recite that the artery is completely blocked or a degree to which the artery is blocked.

As to the rejection of claim 34, applicants argue that the prior art fails to show other pulmonary arteries compensating for the blocked secondary pulmonary artery. The instant specification describes this compensation arising from encapsulation over time of a small diameter sensing unit, which blocks the artery in which the sensing unit resides, such that other arteries may compensate for the blocked artery (see p. 11 of the instant specification). Rich discloses encapsulation of the sensor unit (see entire document, especially paragraph 76 of Rich) and further discloses long term use of the sensing unit (see entire document, especially paragraph 74 of Rich), such that in the disclosed long-term use of the sensor, the disclosed encapsulation over time would necessarily block the artery, requiring compensation for the blocked artery by other arteries, as described on p. 11 of the instant specification. Therefore, the rejections stand.